October 2012 – September 2015

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In 2012, the Bureau of Long Term Care (BLTC) within the Idaho Division of Medicaid received approval for a five-year renewal of the Aged and Disabled (A&D) Waiver. This document reflects the evidence that supports the Quality Improvement Strategy (QIS) submitted as part of the A&D Waiver application. It includes the measures, processes and data Idaho used to determine that each waiver assurance has been and continues to be met during the period the waiver is in effect (discovery); the measures and processes employed to correct identified problems (remediation); the roles and responsibilities of the parties involved in measuring performance and making improvements; the processes employed to aggregate and analyze trends in the identification and remediation of problems; and the processes employed to establish priorities, develop strategies for, and assess implementation of system improvements. This information covers the waiver period from October 2012 through September 2015. The data, for purposes of this request for evidence, includes calendar year 2012 through the third calendar quarter of 2015.

In July of 2014, the Medicare-Medicaid Coordinated Plan (MMCP) was expanded to include long-term services and supports, including A&D Waiver services. The Bureau of Long Term Care retains administrative authority over the health plan's administration of waiver services. The performance data collected by the health plan administering the MMCP is included in the data analysis section of this report.

The major emphasis on Idaho's quality improvement activities during the last two years has been to improve the quality of service plans through increased provider training and improvement in the collection of participant feedback.

October 2012 – September 2015

#### **ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES**

The Division of Medicaid, Bureau of Long Term Care (BLTC) has a quality management committee, the Bureau of Long Term Care Committee (BLTCC), whose function is to review quality improvement strategy findings and analysis, including trending, formulate remediation recommendations, and identify and address any statewide resource or program issues. The BLTCC team includes the Bureau Chief, regional Program Managers, Project Manager, and policy and quality staff.

The results of the quality findings and recommendations are reported in the BLTCC minutes and reports, and are then presented to the Central Office Management Team (COMT). Aggregated quarterly reports on quality assurance activities and findings are also presented to the Personal Assistance Oversight Committee (PAOC). The purpose of the PAOC is to plan, monitor, and recommend changes to the Medicaid waiver and personal assistance programs. The PAOC membership consists of waiver participants, providers, advocacy organizations, and other interested stakeholders.

At the bureau level, Nurse Managers and Program Managers are responsible for remediating any specific caseload performance issues and/or training and educating staff on any adopted statewide design changes. The Quality Manager(s) are responsible for training and educating Quality Improvement Specialists on any adopted statewide design changes.

At the administrative level, the Bureau Leadership Team is responsible for reviewing BLTCC and other Medicaid program reports, analyses and recommendations. They consider the status of Division-wide resources, coordination issues and strategies. The Central Office Management Team (COMT) then makes final system-wide change decisions.

October 2012 – September 2015

#### **TOOLS & PROCESSES**

The following processes (Quality Improvement Strategies) are used to monitor, remediate and make system improvements in the administration and operation of the A&D Waiver. Each process contributes to the reports that are included in the HCBS Quality Review.

- Internal File Audit Process (APPENDIX BB) BLTC Nurse Managers and Program
   Managers monitor the performance of BLTC staff in the administration of the A&D Waiver.

   The BLTC Internal Audit forms and process are used by the Nurse Manager or Program
   Manager to review work completed by the Nurse Reviewers, QA Specialists and Support
   Staff. The information from the Internal Audit process is critical in the monitoring of the following HCBS Waiver assurances:
  - The level of care of enrolled participants is reevaluated at least annually or as specified in the approved waiver.
  - The process and instruments described in the approved waiver are applied appropriately and according to the approved description to determine participant level of care.
- Complaint/Critical Incident Process (APPENDIX CC) All complaints and critical incidents received are documented and recorded in the SharePoint data system. The documented components of each incident require specific dates, nature of complaint/critical incident, narrative, referrals when necessary, a classification of substantiated or unsubstantiated, remediation action(s) taken, investigation outcome data and a closure date.

October 2012 – September 2015

- Nurse Reviewer Home Visit Process (APPENDIX DD) The BLTC Nurse Reviewer Home Visit (NRHV) form is completed by the Nurse Reviewer (NR) on all A&D Waiver and Adult Personal Care Services (PCS) redeterminations. Nurse Reviewer Home Visit results are sent to the provider with the redetermination results. The data from this process is compiled quarterly. The information gleaned from the aggregated Nurse Reviewer Home Visit form data is critical in statewide monitoring of HCBS Waiver Assurances under Level of Care, Service Plan and Administrative Authority.
- BLTC Provider Review Process (APPENDIX EE) The BLTC Provider Agencies who have active billing of selected waiver services in the last two (2) years are reviewed on a two (2) year cycle, but not later than two (2) years and thirty (30) days past the previous review. The BLTC Agency Quality Assurance reviews may need to be conducted more often in some circumstances. Examples of circumstances when a provider would be reviewed sooner than scheduled include; 90 day follow up on corrective action plans that do not show evidence the CAP was sustained, trend in complaints and critical incidents related to abuse, neglect, exploitation and/or quality of care issues. Provider review results are sent to the providers during the provider Quality Improvement (QI) review process. The data from this process is compiled quarterly.

#### SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT

When the Central Office Management Team (COMT) approves system design changes, the BLTCC monitors the implementation and ongoing effectiveness of the design change.

It is the responsibility of the Quality Assurance team to review QI processes and instruments through monthly conference calls, supported by team minutes, to oversee the daily QI processes and report to the BLTCC. The Quality Assurance team includes a Quality Manager, an Internal Quality Manager, and Quality Improvement Specialists. The Quality Assurance team identifies and reports trends to the Quality Improvement Team, which is a team comprised of the Bureau Chief, Quality Manager and Alternate Care Coordinator. The Quality Improvement Team is responsible for analyzing the effectiveness of existing quality designs and making targeted system improvements. If a system improvement is needed, the recommendation is reviewed by the BLTCC for approval, and a recommendation is sent to the COMT for direction regarding implementation.

The Division of Medicaid evaluates and improves processes and systems on an ongoing basis. Each year the BLTC strives to improve service delivery and quality to waiver participants by using numerous data points and trends, appropriate analysis and prioritization techniques, and evaluation and feedback from various groups.

The Quality Improvement Strategy is reviewed by the Quality Assurance team and the BLTC Committee on an annual basis, and is then submitted to Bureau Leadership Team and PAOC.

#### **RESULTS & ANALYSIS**

The following charts are organized by Waiver Assurance category and include the performance measure, the data collected (discovery), and the remediation/system improvements.

October 2012 – September 2015

### I. LEVEL OF CARE (LOC) Determination

Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System Improvement
a. An evaluation for LOC	Number and percent of applicants	BLTC Quality Improvement Summary	None Needed – A 100%
is provided to all	meeting Nursing Facility level of	<b>Report:</b> Includes number of initial adult	review of applicants are
applicants for whom	care during their initial assessment	applications for BLTC programs (A&D	assessed for A&D waiver
there is reasonable	for A&D waiver services.	Waiver and State Plan Personal Care	services. There has been a
indication that services		<b>Services</b> ) and the number that met Nursing	steady increase in the percent
may be needed in the	a. Numerator: Number of applicants	Facility (NF) level of care per calendar	of applicants that meet Nursing
future.	meeting Nursing Facility level of	quarter and annually.	Facility (NF) LOC.
	care during their initial assessment	Initial applications include new first time	
	for A&D waiver services	applicants, applicants that had a break in	
		services, re-applied, and applicants who are	
	b. Denominator: Number of initial	denied and re-apply.	
	assessments (applicants) for A&D		
	waiver services.	<u>2012 – Appendix A</u>	
		2,360 Met NF LOC	
	Sampling approach of analyzed	3,538 Applications	
	collected data approved in current	67% Met	
	waiver is specified as a 100%	<u>2013 – Appendix B</u>	
	review.	2,599 Met NF LOC	
		3,546 Applications	
		73% Met	
		<u>2014 – Appendix C</u>	
		2,946 Met NF LOC	
		3,805 Applications	

October 2012 – September 2015

### I. LEVEL OF CARE (LOC) Determination

Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System
		·	Improvement
		77% Met	
		<b>2015 (YTD) – Appendix D</b>	
		2,285 Met NF LOC	
		2,898 Applications	
		79% Met	
		MMCP – Appendix U	MMCP - The Medicare-
		July 1, 2014 – July 30, 2015	Medicaid Coordinated Plan
		56 Met NF LOC	(MMCP) was launched in July
		69 Applications	2014. During July 1, 2014
		81% Met	through June 30, 2015, the
			Managed Care Entity (MCE)
			conducted the initial
			assessments for A&D waiver
			applications when the
			participant was already eligible
			for Idaho Medicaid and did not
			need a LOC decision for
			Medicaid eligibility.
b. The levels of care of	Number and percent of participants	Internal File Audit Report: Random	See Appendix E – H for
enrolled participants are	who received annual eligibility	sample review of participant files during the	remediation.
reevaluated at least	redetermination (redet) within 364	Internal File Audit Process.	Reasons for late
annually or as specified	days of prior A&D waiver eligibility		redeterminations:

October 2012 – September 2015

### I. LEVEL OF CARE (LOC) Determination

Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System
			Improvement
in the approved waiver.	assessment.	<u>2012 – Appendix E</u>	1. Participant requesting delay
		298 - Completed within 364 days	2. Nurse Reviewer vacancies
	a. Numerator: # of participants who	306 - Files Audited	3. Nurse Reviewer workload
	received annual eligibility	97% - Completed timely	
	redetermination within 364 days of	<u>2013 – Appendix F</u>	Raw data available in Quality
	prior assessment.	275 - Completed within 364 days	Management SharePoint.
		286 - Files Audited	
	b. Denominator: # of participants	96% - Completed timely	
	who should have received annual	<u>2014 – Appendix G</u>	
	redetermination of eligibility within	278 – Completed within 364 days	
	364 days of prior assessment.	282 – Files Audited	
		99% - Completed timely	
	Sampling approach of analyzed	2015 (YTD) – Appendix H	<b>MMCP</b> - The MMCP was
	collected data approved in current	250 – Completed within 364 days	launched in July 2014. During
	waiver is specified as 336 Internal	257 – Files Audited	July 1, 2014 through June 30,
	File Audits per year. This sample	97% - Completed timely	2015, the MCE conducted the
	selection includes both initial and		initial assessments for A&D
	redetermination participants. The	MMCP – Appendix V	waiver applications when the
	number reported in the discovery	2014 Q4	participant was already eligible
	column reflects the redeterminations	*Plan phased in this data collection after	for Idaho Medicaid and did not
	only for this specific sub assurance.	initial launch	need a LOC decision for
		26 – Completed within 364 days	Medicaid eligibility. The MCE
		26 – Total redeterminations due	was also responsible for a

October 2012 – September 2015

### I. LEVEL OF CARE (LOC) Determination

Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System
		100% - Completed timely	Improvement portion of redetermination
		2015 (Q1 and Q2)	assessments. This process was
			discontinued as of June 30,
		*Plan phased out this data collection in Q3	, ·
		2015 – BLTC now includes MCE enrollees	2015 and BLTC has reassumed
		in Internal File Audit sample	all LOC determinations for
		74 – Completed within 364 days	waiver services regardless of
		74 – Total redeterminations due	MCE enrollment status.
		100% – Completed timely	
c. The process and	Number and percent of a sample of	<b>Internal File Audit Report:</b> Review of	<b>Remediation:</b> Individual
instruments described in	Nurse Reviewer level of care	sample of participant files during the	Nurse Reviewer counseling,
the approved waiver are	assessments for A&D Waiver	Internal File Audit Process.	training and educating. All
applied appropriately	eligibility that were determined		incorrect determinations were
and according to the	appropriately.	<u> 2012 – Appendix E</u>	corrected and participant
approved description to		358 - LOC determined correctly	services authorized.
determine participant	a. Numerator: Number of a sample	359 - Files Audited	
level of care.	of Nurse Reviewer level of care	99% - Determined correctly	
	assessments for A&D Waiver	2013 – Appendix F	
	eligibility that was determined	349 - LOC determined correctly	
	appropriately.	355 - Files Audited	
		98% - Determined correctly	
	b. Denominator: Total number of	2014 – Appendix G	
	A&D waiver eligibility	356 - LOC determined correctly	<b>MMCP</b> - As part of the state's
	determinations that were sampled	356 - Files Audited	initial review of the LOC

October 2012 – September 2015

### I. LEVEL OF CARE (LOC) Determination

	Discovery	Remediation/System Improvement
for appropriateness.  Sampling approach of analyzed collected data approved in current waiver is specified as 336 Internal File Audits per year. This value is the minimum required; therefore, data can and does include those over and above the minimum if deemed necessary by the Nurse Manager. This sample selection includes both initial and redetermination participants level of care review. The number reported in the discovery column reflects the total number of files analyzed for this specific sub assurance.	100% - Determined correctly  2015 (YTD) - Appendix H  302 - LOC determined correctly 302 - Files Audited 100% - Determined correctly  MMCP - Appendix W  2014 Q4  *Plan phased in this data collection after initial launch, no data for Q3 or Q4. BLTC	<u> </u>

II. SERVICE PLANS			
The State demonstrates it has o	designed and implemented an effective s	system for reviewing the adequacy of service pl	lans for waiver participants.
Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System
			Improvement
a. Service plans address all	1. Number and percent of service	Nurse Reviewer Home Visit (NRHV)	Nurse Reviewer Home Visit
participants' assessed	plans reviewed that reflected the	<b>Report:</b> Includes the data collected by	reports are sent to the provider
needs (including health	health care needs (functional), health	Nurse Reviewers during the redetermination	at redetermination with
and safety risk factors)	& safety risks and personal goals of	process. Sample is 100% of	instructions to remediate any
and personal goals, either	the participant.	redeterminations excluding Home Delivered	deficiencies. Quarterly
by the provision of		Meals (HDM) and Personal Emergency	aggregate reports are sent to
waiver services or	a. Numerator: Number of service	Response System (PERS) providers.	agencies for Corrective Action
through other means	plans reviewed that reflected the		Plans (CAPs) when the
	health care needs (functional)	<u>2012 – Appendix I</u>	aggregate data falls below the
	and personal goals of the	1. Health Care Needs/Goals	Statewide average or 85%
	participant.	4,904 – Reflected Functional Needs/Goals	whichever is less. (Individual
	b. Denominator: Number of service	5,269 – Service Plans Reviewed	provider reports available)
	plans reviewed.	93% - Reflected Functional Needs/Goals	
		2. Health & Safety Needs/Risk Assessment	In quarter 2 of 2013 the data
	2. Number and percent of service	4,862 – Reflected H&S Needs/Risk Factors	regarding the Service Plan
	plans reviewed that reflected the	5,244 - Service Plans Reviewed	reflecting the participant's
	health & safety risks of the	93% - Service Plans reflected H&S	goals, H&S/Risk Factors and
	participant.	Needs/Risk Factors	potential risks/back up plans
	a. Numerator: Number of service	<u>2013 – Appendix J</u>	were separated into three
	plans reviewed that reflected the	1. H&S Needs/Risk Factors	separate performance
	health and safety risks of the	4,202 – Reflected Functional Needs	measures. This was a system
	participant.	4,760 – Service Plans Reviewed	change to improve our
	b. Denominator: Number of service	88% - Reflected H&S Needs/Risk Factors	targeting of performance
	plans reviewed.	2. Participant Goals	measures for provider
		3,106 – Reflected Participant Goals	improvement.

September 2015

Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	e system for reviewing the adequacy of service Discovery	Remediation/System
		21333 ( 013	Improvement
	Sampling approach of analyzed	3,558 – Service Plans Reviewed	In 2015 the assessment of
	collected data approved in current	87% - Reflected Functional Needs/Goals	participant goals being
	waiver is specified as a	<u>2014 – Appendix K</u>	addressed in the Service Plan
	representative sample with a	1. H&S Needs/Risk Factors	was removed from the NRHV
	confidence interval equal to 95%.	4,075 – Reflected Functional Needs	process as it was addressed in
		4,603 – Service Plans Reviewed	the Provider Quality Review.
		89% - Reflected H&S Needs/Risk Factors	
		2. Participant Goals	To address low compliance in
		4,070 – Reflected Participant Goals	Service Plan requirements,
		4,596 – Service Plans Reviewed	statewide training was
		89% - Reflected Participant Goals	provided in the Spring of 201
		<b>2015 (YTD) – Appendix L</b>	and the development of online
		1. H&S Needs/Risk Factors	Service Plan Training
		3,169 – Reflected Functional Needs	Modules.
		3,483 – Service Plans Reviewed	
		91% - Reflected H&S Needs/Risk Factors	In 2015 a process improveme
		<b>2015 (YTD) – Appendix P</b>	was made to offer and conduc
		2. Participant Goals	face-to-face provider training
		45 – Reflected Participant Goals	on a semi-annual basis.
		57 – Service Plans Reviewed	
		79% - Reflected Participant Goals	In 2015 the requirement for
			Service Plans to include
			participant goals to be
			addressed during the year wa
			monitored through the

October 2012 – September 2015

### II. SERVICE PLANS

Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	system for reviewing the adequacy of service positions of the position of the system for reviewing the adequacy of service positions are supplied by the system for reviewing the adequacy of service positions are supplied by the system for reviewing the adequacy of service positions are supplied by the system for reviewing the adequacy of service positions are supplied by the system for reviewing the adequacy of service positions are supplied by the system for reviewing the adequacy of service positions are supplied by the system for reviewing the system for reviewing the adequacy of service positions are supplied by the system for reviewing the system for th	Remediation/System
			Improvement
			Provider QA process instead of
			the Nurse Reviewer Home
		MMCP – Appendix X	Visit Process.
		2014 Q3 and Q4	
		1. Health Care Needs/Goals	<b>MMCP</b> – The MCE has been
		21 – Reflected Functional Needs/Goals	educated on an ongoing basis
		39 – Service Plans Reviewed	on appropriate review of
		53% - Reflected Functional Needs/Goals	service plans and remediation
		2. Health & Safety Needs/Risk Assessment	processes for providers when
		26 – Reflected H&S Needs/Risk Factors	deficiencies are identified.
		39 - Service Plans Reviewed	
		67% - Service Plans reflected H&S	
		Needs/Risk Factors	
		2015 (YTD)	
		1. Health Care Needs/Goals	
		11 – Reflected Functional Needs/Goals	
		15 – Service Plans Reviewed	
		73% - Reflected Functional Needs/Goals	
		2. Health & Safety Needs/Risk Assessment	
		11 – Reflected H&S Needs/Risk Factors	
		15– Service Plans Reviewed	
		73% - Service Plans reflected H&S	
		Needs/Risk Factor	
1. The State monitor	rs Number and percent of service plans	Nurse Reviewer Home Visit Report:	Nurse Reviewer Home Visit
service plan	reviewed that reflected participant	Includes the data collected by Nurse	reports are sent to the provider

II. SERVICE PLANS			
The State demonstrates it has	designed and implemented an effective s	system for reviewing the adequacy of service p	lans for waiver participants.
Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System
			Improvement
development in	choices (i.e., time of service, days of	Reviewers during the re-determination	at redetermination with
accordance with its	service, etc.)	process. Sample is 100% of	instructions to remediate any
policies and		redeterminations minus HDM and PERS	deficiencies. Quarterly
procedures.	a. Numerator: Number of service	providers	aggregate reports are sent to
	plans reviewed that reflected	<u>2012 – Appendix I</u>	agencies for Corrective Action
	participant choices.	4,829 - Participant's indicated their service	Plans when the aggregate data
	b. Denominator: Number of service	plans reflected their choices	falls below the Statewide
	plans reviewed.	5,016 - Service Plans Reviewed	average or 85% whichever is
		96% Service Plans reflected participant	less. (Individual provider
	Sampling approach of analyzed	choices	reports available)
	collected data approved in current	<u>2013 – Appendix J</u>	
	waiver is specified as a	6,577 - Participant's indicated their service	In 2013, the participant
	representative sample with a	plans reflected their choices	experience question related to
	confidence interval equal to 95%.	6,697 - Service Plans Reviewed	choices on their Service Plan
		98% Service Plans reflected participant	was expanded to include
		choices	participants residing in
		<u>2014 – Appendix K</u>	Certified Family Homes (CFH)
		6,762 - Participant's indicated their service	and Residential Assisted
		plans reflected their choices	Living Facilities (RALF).
		6,983 - Service Plans Reviewed	
		97% Service Plans reflected participant	
		choices	
		<b>2015 (YTD) – Appendix L</b>	
		3,340 - Participant's indicated their service	
		plans reflected their choices	

II. SERVICE PLANS			
	-	system for reviewing the adequacy of service	
Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System
			Improvement
		3,419 - Service Plans Reviewed	
		98% Service Plans reflected participant	
		choices	
		MMCP – Appendix X	MMCP - The MCE has been
		2014 Q3 and Q4	advised to increase the sample
		17 - Participants indicated their service	size for plan review and to
		plans reflected their choices	include a review of RALF
		17 - Service Plans Reviewed	plans in their sample for all
		100% Service Plans reflected participant	applicable service plan criteria.
		choices	The MCE continues to use its
		2015 (YTD)	internal provider quality
		11 - Participants indicated their service	control process to ensure
		plans reflected their choices	agency compliance.
		15 - Service Plans Reviewed	
		73% Service Plans reflected participant	
		choices	
2. Service plans are	1. Number and percent of service	Nurse Reviewer Home Visit Report:	Nurse Reviewer Home Visit
updated revised at	plans reviewed that were updated	Includes the data collected by Nurse	reports are sent to the provider
least annually or	annually.	Reviewers during the re-determination	at redetermination with
when warranted by	a. Numerator: # of service plans	process. Sample is 100% of current	instructions to remediate any
changes in the waiver	reviewed in the home at annual	participants minus HDM and PERS	deficiencies. Quarterly
participant's needs.	redetermination that were	providers.	aggregate reports are sent to
	updated/current.		agencies for Corrective Action
	b. Denominator: Total # of service	<u>2012 – Appendix I</u>	Plans when the aggregate data

September 2015

II. SERVICE PLAN The State demonstrates i		system for reviewing the adequacy of service p	plans for waiver participants.
Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System Improvement
	plans reviewed at redetermination.	1. Number & Percent of Service Plans Updated Annually 5,088 – Current Service Plans in home	falls below the Statewide average or 85% whichever is less. (Individual provider
	2. Number and percent of service plans reviewed that were	5,400 – Annual Redeterminations 94% - Participant's had current Service	reports are available)
	updated/revised when warranted by changes in the waiver participant's needs/goals.  a. Numerator: # of service plans reviewed that were updated/revised due to changes in the waiver participant's needs/goals.  b. Denominator: # of service plans reviewed that should have been updated/revised because of	Plans in their home  2. Number & Percent of Services Plans revised/updated when warranted  2,525 – Service Plans were updated when needed  2,937 – Service Plans that needed updates/revisions  86% - Service Plans updated when needed.  2013 – Appendix J  1. Number & Percent of Service Plans Updated Annually	The low performance by provider agencies in 2012 and 2013 resulted in a statewide training effort in 2014 and the development and implementation of online provider training modules related to Service Plans and Documentation.  The trend of providers not
	changes in the participant's needs/goals.	4,559 – Current Service Plans in home 4,838 – Annual Redeterminations 94% - Participant's had current Service	updating Service Plans when warranted by the participant's needs or change in condition
	Sampling approach of analyzed collected data approved in current waiver is specified as a representative sample with a confidence interval equal to 95%.	Plans in their home 2. Number & Percent of Services Plans revised/updated when warranted 2,217 – Service Plans were updated when needed	continued in 2014. Semi- annual statewide face-to-face provider trainings in each region were implemented in 2015.

Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System Improvement
		updates/revisions	
		85% - Service Plans updated when needed.	
		<b>2014 – Appendix K</b>	
		1. Number & Percent of Service Plans	
		Updated Annually	
		4,384 – Current Service Plans in home	
		4,639 – Annual Redeterminations	
		95% - Participant's had current Service	
		Plans in their home	
		2. Number & Percent of Services Plans	
		revised/updated when warranted	
		926 – Service Plans were updated when	
		needed	
		1,229 – Service Plans that needed	
		updates/revisions	
		75% - Service Plans updated when needed.	
		<b>2015 (YTD) – Appendix L</b>	
		1. Number & Percent of Service Plans	
		Updated Annually	
		3,321 – Current Service Plans in home	
		3,564 – Annual Redeterminations	
		93% - Participant's had current Service	
		Plans in their home	
		2. Number & Percent of Services Plans	
		revised/updated when warranted	

II. SERVICE PLANS			
	-	system for reviewing the adequacy of service p	
Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System
			Improvement
		1,267 – Service Plans were updated when needed 1,613 – Service Plans that needed	
		updates/revisions	
		79% - Service Plans updated when needed.	
		MMCP - Appendix X	MMCP – The MCE was
		2014 Q3 and Q4 1. Number & Percent of Service Plans Updated Annually	permitted to develop their own sampling methodology for review of service plans. This
		39 – Current Service Plans in home 39 – Annual Care Coordination Visit forms	resulted in a very small sample size, causing an inaccurate
		reviewed	reflection of service plan
		100% - Cases reviewed where participant had a current Service Plans in their home	quality.
		2. Number & Percent of Services Plans	The MCE has been advised to
		revised/updated when warranted	increase the sample size for
		6 – Service Plans were updated when	plan review and to include a
		needed	review of Residential Assisted
		6 – Service Plans that needed	Living Facility (RALF)
		updates/revisions	resident plans in their sample
		100% - Service Plans updated when needed	for all applicable service plan
		2015 (YTD)	criteria. The MCE continues to
		1. Number & Percent of Service Plans	use its internal provider quality
		Updated Annually	control process to ensure

The State demonstrates it has o	designed and implemented an effective s	system for reviewing the adequacy of service pl	ans for waiver participants.
Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System Improvement
		11 – Current Service Plans in home 15 – Annual Care Coordination Visit forms reviewed 73% - Cases reviewed where participant had a current Service Plans in their home 2. Number & Percent of Services Plans revised/updated when warranted 4 – Service Plans were updated when needed 4 – Service Plans that needed updates/revisions 100% - Service Plans updated when needed	agency compliance.
3. Services are delivered in accordance with the service plan, including the type, scope, amount, duration and frequency specified in the service plan	Number and percent of service plans reviewed that indicate services were delivered consistent with the service type, scope, amount, duration and frequency approved by the Department.  a. Numerator: # of service plans reviewed that indicate services were delivered consistent with the service type, scope, duration and frequency approved by the Dept.	Nurse Reviewer Home Visit Report: Includes the data collected by Nurse Reviewers during the redetermination process. Sample is 100% of current participants excluding Home Delivered Meals (HDM) and Personal Emergency Response System (PERS) providers.  2012 – Appendix I 4,572 – Documentation reflected that services delivered in accordance with the Service Plan 5,219 – Annual Redeterminations	Nurse Reviewer Home Visit reports are sent to the provider at redetermination with instructions to remediate any deficiencies. Quarterly aggregate reports are sent to agencies for Corrective Action Plans when the aggregate data falls below the Statewide average or 85% whichever is less. (Individual provider reports are available)

II. SERVICE PLANS				
		system for reviewing the adequacy of service pl		
Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System	
			Improvement	
	b. Denominator: # of service plans	88% - Services delivered in accordance with	Focused review of CAPs are	
	reviewed.	the Service Plan.	completed by the QA staff and	
		2013 – Appendix J	further action is taken if	
	Sampling approach of analyzed	4,280 – Documentation reflected that	required, including request for	
	collected data approved in current	services delivered in accordance with the	additional documentation,	
	waiver is specified as a	Service Plan	providing additional provider	
	representative sample with a	4,700 – Annual Redeterminations	education and training, referral	
	confidence interval equal to 95%.	91% - Services delivered in accordance with	of cases to Medicaid Program	
		the Service Plan.	Integrity Unit, which could	
		<u> 2014 – Appendix K</u>	include improper billing	
		4,147 – Documentation reflected that	practices and/or failure to	
		services delivered in accordance with the	complete required Criminal	
		Service Plan	History & Background Checks,	
		4,608 – Annual Redeterminations	and action up to and including	
		90% - Services delivered in accordance with	provider termination.	
		the Service Plan.		
		<b>2015 (YTD) – Appendix L</b>	QA staff track trends in	
		3,258 – Documentation reflected that	substantiated quality and	
		services delivered in accordance with the	access issues and report those	
		Service Plan	findings through BLTCC and	
		3,483 – Annual Redeterminations	COMT for further assessment	
		94% - Services delivered in accordance with	and action.	
		the Service Plan.		
		MMCP – Appendix X		

The State demonstrates it has o	designed and implemented an effective s	system for reviewing the adequacy of service p	ians for waiver participants.
Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System
			Improvement
		*Plan phased in this data collection. No	
		data for 2014 Q3 or Q4	
		2015 (YTD)	
		No data for 2015 Q1.	
		7 – Documentation reflected that services	
		delivered in accordance with the service	
		plan	
		10 – Annual Care Coordination Visit forms	
		reviewed	
		70% – Services delivered in accordance	
		with the Service Plan.	
4. Participants are	Number and percent of waiver	Internal File Audit Report: Review of	The participant files audited
afforded a choice:	participants who indicated that they	sample of participant files during the	where the records did not
Between waiver	were given a choice between waiver	Internal File Audit Process.	contain a copy of the
services and	services and institutional care.	2012	participant choice selection
institutional care; and	N N I C	2012 – Appendix E	signature form between waiver
between/among waiver services and	a. Numerator: Number of	437 - Choice of Waiver versus Institutional	or institutional care, were
	participants reviewed in a random	Care documented 437 - Files Audited	remediated by having the Nurse Reviewer obtain a
providers.	sample of records who indicted they		choice form from the
	were given a choice between waiver services and institutional care.	100% - Participants afforded choice of Waiver versus Institutional Care	
	services and institutional care.	2013 – Appendix F	participant at the time the issued was identified to
	b. Denominator: Number of	424 - Choice of Waiver versus Institutional	completed the record.
	participants reviewed.	Care documented	completed the record.
	participants reviewed.	433 - Files Audited	

September 2015

Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System Improvement
	Sampling approach of analyzed	98% - Participants afforded choice of	
	collected data approved in current	Waiver versus Institutional Care	
	waiver is specified as a	2014 – Appendix G	
	representative sample with a	427 – Choice of Waiver versus Institutional	
	confidence interval equal to 95%.	Care documented	
		444 - Files Audited	
		96% - Participants afforded choice of	
		Waiver versus Institutional Care	
		<b>2015 (YTD) – Appendix H</b>	
		305 – Choice of Waiver versus Institutional	
		Care documented	
		313 – Files Audited	<b>MMCP</b> – The MCE was
		97% - Files reflected a choice of Waiver	permitted to develop their of
		versus Institutional Care	sampling methodology for review of service plans. Th
		MMCP – Appendix X	resulted in a very small san
		2014 Q3 and Q4	size, causing an inaccurate
		17 – Choice of Waiver versus Institutional	reflection of service plan
		Care documented	quality.
		17 – Files Audited	
		100% - Participants afforded choice of	The MCE has been advised
		Waiver versus Institutional Care	increase the sample size for
		2015 (YTD)	plan review and to include
		13 – Choice of Waiver versus Institutional	review of RALF plans in th
		Care documented	sample for all applicable

October 2012 – September 2015

II. SERVICE PLANS					
The State demonstrates it has d	lesigned and implemented an effective s	system for reviewing the adequacy of service pl	lans for waiver participants.		
Sub Assurances Performance Measure Discovery Remediation/System					
			Improvement		
		6 - Choice implied/Admission Agreement	service plan criteria. The MCE		
		CFH/RALF	has been educated on accurate		
		21 – Files Audited	data collection for this waiver		
		90% - Participants afforded choice of	assurance.		
		Waiver versus Institutional Care			

### III. QUALIFIED PROVIDER

Sub Assurance	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System
			Improvement
a. The state verifies that	Number and percent of new,	Licensure & Certification Data:	New providers who require a
providers initially and	licensed/certified A&D waiver		license and/or certification
continually meet required	providers that meet required	Certified Family Homes (New) – Data	(Certified Family Homes and
licensure and /or	licensure or certification standards.	reflects new CFH's reviewed for	Residential Assisted Living
certification standards		certification for both A&D and DD waiver.	Facilities) are not approved for
and adhere to other	a. Numerator: Number of new	At this time it Is not known at time of	rendering any services prior to
standards prior to their	A&D waiver providers who	certification which population they will	receipt of
furnishing waiver	meet required licensure or	serve.	licensure/certification.
services.	certification standards.	<u>2012 – Appendix A</u>	
	b. Denominator: Number of new	215 - New Providers that met Certification	Providers who do not meet
	A&D waiver providers subject to	Standards	licensure/certification
	licensure or certification	215 - New Providers Subject to	standards are not approved as
	standards.	Certification	Medicaid providers.

October 2012 – September 2015

### III. QUALIFIED PROVIDER

Sub Assurance	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System Improvement
		100% New Providers Met Certification	
	Sampling approach of analyzed	Standards	
	collected data approved in current	<b>2013 – Appendix B</b>	
	waiver is specified as a 100%	216 - New Providers that met Certification	
	review.	Standards	
		216 - New Providers Subject to	
		Certification	
		100% New Providers Met Certification	
		Standards	
		<b>2014 – Appendix C</b>	
		235 - New Providers that met Certification	
		Standards	
		235 - New Providers Subject to	
		Certification	
		100% New Providers Met Certification	
		Standards	
		<b>2015 (YTD)</b> – <b>Appendix D</b>	
		183 - New Providers that met Certification	
		Standards	
		183 - New Providers Subject to	
		Certification	
		100% New Providers Met Certification	
		Standards	

October 2012 – September 2015

### III. QUALIFIED PROVIDER

Sub Assurance	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System
			Improvement
		Residential Assisted Living Facilities (New)	
		<ul> <li>Data reflects new RALFs that were</li> </ul>	
		reviewed for certification. At the time of	
		certification it is not known if the facility	
		will accept Medicaid participants or not.	
		<b>2012 – Appendix A</b>	
		16 - New Providers that met Licensure	
		Standards	
		17 - New Providers Subject to Licensure	
		94% New Providers Met Licensure	
		Standards	
		<b>2013 – Appendix B</b>	
		11 - New Providers that met Licensure	
		Standards	
		17 - New Providers Subject to Licensure	
		65% New Providers Met Licensure	
		Standards	
		2014 – Appendix C	
		19 - New Providers that met Licensure	
		Standards	
		22 - New Providers Subject to Licensure	
		86% New Providers Met Licensure	
		Standards	
		<b>2015 (YTD) – Appendix D</b>	

October 2012 – September 2015

### III. QUALIFIED PROVIDER

Sub Assurance	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System Improvement
		6 - New Providers that met Licensure	
		Standards	
		10 - New Providers Subject to Licensure	
		60% New Providers Met Licensure	
		Standards	
	Number and percent of existing,	Recertification: Data is collected from the	Existing CFH providers who
	licensed/certified A&D waiver	State of Idaho's Certified Family Homes	fail to meet Certification
	providers that meet required	and Residential Assisted Living Facility	Standards, Certifications are
	licensure or certification standards.	Programs.	revoked and Medicaid provider
			agreements and authorizations
	a. Numerator: Number of existing	Certified Family Homes (Recertification's)	are terminated.
	A&D waiver providers who	Data reflects CFH's reviewed for re-	
	meet required licensure or	certification for both A&D and DD waiver.	
	certification standards.	At this time it is not documented at re-	
	b. Denominator: Number of	certification which population they serve.	
	existing A&D waiver providers		
	subject to licensure or	<u>2012 – Appendix A</u>	
	certification standards.	2,166 - Existing Providers that met	
		Certification Standards	
	Sampling approach of analyzed	2,174 - Existing Providers Subject to	
	collected data approved in current	Certification	
	waiver is specified as a 100%	99% Existing Providers Met Certification	
	review.	Standards	
		<u>2013 – Appendix B</u>	

October 2012 – September 2015

### III. QUALIFIED PROVIDER

Sub Assurance	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System Improvement
		2,197 - Existing Providers that met	Improvement
		Certification Standards	
		2,203 - Existing Providers Subject to	
		Certification	
		99% Existing Providers Met Certification	
		Standards	
		2014 – Appendix C	
		2,265 - Existing Providers that met	
		Certification Standards	
		2,265 - Existing Providers Subject to Certification	
		100% Existing Providers Met Certification	
		Standards	
		2015 (YTD) – Appendix D	
		2,308 - Existing Providers that met	
		Certification Standards	
		2,321 - Existing Providers Subject to	
		Certification	
		99% Existing Providers Met Certification	
		Standards	
		Residential Assisted Living Facilities must	Current Residential Assisted
		meet re-licensure every two years – Data	Living Facilities who were not
		reflects current RALFs that were reviewed	in compliance during their

October 2012 – September 2015

### III. QUALIFIED PROVIDER

Sub Assurance	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System Improvement
		for re-licensure.	licensure review submitted
			corrective action plans and
		<b>2012 – Appendix A</b>	came into compliance.
		271 - Existing Providers that met Licensure	_
		Standards	
		313 - Existing Providers Subject to	
		Licensure	
		87% Existing Providers Met Licensure	
		Standards	
		<b>2013 – Appendix B</b>	
		270 - Existing Providers that met Licensure	
		Standards	
		302 - Existing Providers Subject to	
		Licensure	
		89% Existing Providers Met Licensure	
		Standards	
		<b>2014 – Appendix C</b>	
		257 - Existing Providers that met Licensure	
		Standards	
		295 - Existing Providers Subject to	
		Licensure	
		87% Existing Providers Met Licensure	
		Standards	
		<b>2015 (YTD) – Appendix D</b>	

October 2012 – September 2015

### III. QUALIFIED PROVIDER

Sub Assurance	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System
			Improvement
		158 - Existing Providers that met Licensure	
		Standards	
		182 - Existing Providers Subject to	
		Licensure	
		87% New Providers Met Licensure	
		Standards	
b. The State monitors non-	Number and percent of new, non-	Data obtained from BLTC Quality	New non-licensed/non-
licensed/non-certified	licensed/non-certified A&D waiver	Management Training section on	certified providers are not
providers to assure	providers that received Department	SharePoint and reported in the BLTC	issued Medicaid provider
adherence to waiver	training prior to providing services.	Quality Improvement Strategy Summary.	agreements or authorized to
requirements			provide services prior to
	a. Numerator: # of new, non-	<u> 2012 – Appendix A</u>	receiving new provider
	licensed/non-certified A&D	16 - New Non-Licensed Providers trained	training.
	providers that received Dept.	prior to providing services.	
	training before providing	16 - New Non-Licensed Providers	
	services.	100% New Providers Trained Prior to	
	b. Denominator: # of new, non-	providing services.	
	licensed/non-certified A&D	<u>2013 – Appendix B</u>	
	providers scheduled for Dept.	18 - New Non-Licensed Providers trained	
	training before providing	prior to providing services.	
	services.	18 - New Non-Licensed Providers	
		100% New Providers Trained Prior to	
	Sampling approach of analyzed	providing services.	
	collected data approved in current	<u>2014 – Appendix C</u>	

October 2012 – September 2015

### III. QUALIFIED PROVIDER

Sub Assurance	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System
			Improvement
	waiver is specified as a 100%	14 - New Non-Licensed Providers trained	
	review.	prior to providing services.	
		14 - New Non-Licensed Providers	
		100% New Providers Trained Prior to	
		providing services.	
		<b>2015 (YTD) – Appendix D</b>	
		15 - New Non-Licensed Providers trained	
		prior to providing services.	
		15 - New Non-Licensed Providers	
		100% New Providers Trained Prior to	
		providing services.	
	Number and percent of new, non-	Provider Review Report –Includes data	All providers identified as
	licensed/non-certified A&D	collected from Provider Quality Assurance	receiving untimely reviews
	providers that have initial provider	Reviews at 6 Months, 1 year if indicated	were reviewed within 90 days
	review within six months of	and every 2 years thereafter (or as needed).	of the review date.
	providing services to waiver		
	participants.	2012 - Appendix M	2012: No new provider
		10 - New Providers received a review	additional reviews required at
	a. Numerator: # of aforementioned	within 6 months	the 1-year mark.
	providers that had initial review	12 - New Providers	
	within six months of providing	83% Received a timely review	
	services.	<b>2013 - Appendix N</b>	2013: One new provider
	b. Denominator: # of	14 - New Providers received a review	additional review required at
	aforementioned providers	within 6 months	the 1-year mark

October 2012 – September 2015

### III. QUALIFIED PROVIDER

Sub Assurance	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System
			Improvement
	scheduled for an initial review	16 - New Providers	
	within six months of providing	88% Received a timely review	
	services.	<u>2014 - Appendix O</u>	2014: Four new provider
		12 - New Providers received a review	additional review required at
	Sampling approach of analyzed	within 6 months	the 1-year mark
	collected data approved in current	12 - New Providers	
	waiver is specified as a 100%	100% Received a timely review	
	review.	<b>2015 (YTD) - Appendix P</b>	2015 (YTD): Four new
		12 - New Providers received a review	provider additional review
		within 6 months	required at the 1-year mark
		12 - New Providers	
		100% Received a timely review	
	Number and percent of non-	<u>2012 – Appendix M</u>	All providers identified as
	licensed/non-certified A&D waiver	87 - of existing providers received timely	receiving untimely reviews
	providers that received an on-site	review	were reviewed within 90 days
	review every two years.	96 - of existing providers due for 2 year	of the review date.
		review	
	a. Numerator: Number of non-	91% of existing providers received timely	
	licensed/non-certified A&D	review	
	providers that received an on-site	<u>2013 - Appendix N</u>	
	review every two years.	106 - of existing providers received timely	
	b. Denominator: Number of non-	review	
	licensed/non-certified A&D	109 -of existing providers due for 2 year	
	providers scheduled for an on-	review	

October 2012 – September 2015

### III. QUALIFIED PROVIDER

Sub Assurance	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System Improvement
	site review every two years.	97% of existing providers received timely	Improvement
		review	
	Sampling approach of analyzed	<b>2014 - Appendix O</b>	
	collected data approved in current	79 - of existing providers received timely	
	waiver is specified as a 100%	review	
	review.	87 - of existing providers due for 2 year	
		review	
		91% of existing providers received timely	
		review	
		<b>2015 (YTD) - Appendix P</b>	
		77 - of existing providers received timely	
		review	
		85 - of existing providers due for 2 year	
		review	
		91% of existing providers received timely	
		review	
c. The State implements its	Number and percent of A&D waiver	Data obtained from BLTC Quality	Department training is
policies and procedures	providers that received Department	Management Training section on	provided in response to trends
for verifying that	training.	SharePoint and reported in the BLTC	in QA data. In 2014 Statewide
provider training is		Quality Improvement Strategy Summary.	training was provided and
conducted in accordance	a. Numerator: Number of A&D		online training modules were
with state requirements	waiver providers that received	<u>2012 – Appendix A</u>	developed in the areas of:
and the approved waiver.	Department training prior to	145 - Received Department Training	a. Service Plans
	providing services.	323 - A&D Agency Providers	b. Documentation

October 2012 – September 2015

### III. QUALIFIED PROVIDER

Sub Assurance	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System
			Improvement
	b. Denominator: Number of A&D	45% A&D Agency Providers Received	c. Caregiver Training
	waiver providers.	Department Training	Requirements
		<u>2013 – Appendix B</u>	
		139 - Received Department Training	Biannual training was
		338 - A&D Agency Providers	implemented in 2015. In
		41% A&D Agency Providers Received	addition to the 117 A&D
		Department Training	Agency providers who were
		<u>2014 – Appendix C</u>	trained, training was provided
		227 - Received Department Training	to 56 Certified Family Home
		339 - A&D Agency Providers	(CFH) providers and 34
		67% A&D Agency Providers Received	Residential Assisted Living
		Department Training	Facilities (RALF).
		<b>2015 (YTD) – Appendix D</b>	
		188 - Received Department Training	Ongoing training is provided
		347 - A&D Agency Providers	to Nurse Reviewers/Nurse
		54% A&D Agency Providers Received	Managers/Support Staff to
		Department Training	document provider training as
			it occurs.

IV. HEALTH & WELFARE On an on-going basis the state identifies, addresses and seeks to prevent instances of abuse, neglect and exploitation.				
On an on-going basis the state  Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System	
24014200			Improvement	
The State demonstrates on an ongoing basis that it identifies, addresses and seeks to prevent instances of abuse, neglect, exploitation and unexplained death.	Number and percent of service plans reviewed that addressed potential and real risks and had back up plan interventions in place.  a. Numerator: Number of service plans reviewed that addressed potential and real risks and had back up plan interventions in place.  b. Denominator: Number of service plans reviewed.  Sampling approach of analyzed collected data approved in current waiver is specified as a representative sample with a confidence interval equal to 95%.	Nurse Reviewer Home Visit Report: Includes the data collected by Nurse Reviewers during the redetermination process. Sample is 100% of current participants.  2012 – Appendix I Not measured in 2012 2013 – Appendix J 3,886 – Service plans addressed risks and had back up plans in place 4,691 – Annual Redeterminations 83% Service Plans addressed potential and real risks and had back up plans in place 2014 – Appendix K 3,616 – Service plans addressed risks and had back up plans in place 4,608 – Annual Redeterminations 78% Service Plans addressed potential and real risks and had back up plans in place		

Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System Improvement
		3,483 – Annual Redeterminations 84% Service Plans addressed potential and real risks and had back up plans in place	
		MMCP – Appendix Y 2014 Q3 and Q4 Potential Risks/Back Up Plans 42 - Reflected Potential Risks/Back Up Plans 50 - Service Plans Reviewed 84% Service Plans reflected potential risks/back up plans 2015 (YTD) Potential Risks/Back Up Plans 241 – Reflected Potential Risks/Back Up Plans 281 – Service Plans Reviewed 86% Service Plans reflected potential Risks/Back Up Plans	MMCP – The MCE has been advised to include a review of RALF resident plans in their sample for all applicable serviplan criteria. The MCE has be educated on an ongoing basis appropriate review of service plans and remediation process for providers when deficiencies are identified. The MCE continues to use its internal provider quality control procest to ensure agency compliance.

**September 2015** 

IV. HEALTH & WELFARE				
On an on-going basis the state identifies, addresses and seeks to prevent instances of abuse, neglect and exploitation.				
Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System	
			Improvement	
	Number and percent of total	Complaint/Critical Incident Report:	Refer to Appendix Q-T and Z	
	complaints/critical incidents that were	Based on data entered into the	for remediation.	
	related to abuse, neglect and	Statewide Complaint/Critical Incident		
	exploitation.	Database in SharePoint.	In 2013, the state identified a	
			downward trend in the overall	
	a. Numerator: Number of	<b>2012 – Appendix Q</b>	number of complaints/critical	
	complaints/critical incidents that were	67 – Number of Complaints/Critical	incidents being reported.	
	related to abuse, neglect and	Incidents related to		
	exploitation.	abuse/neglect/exploitation	In 2014, the state initiated quality	
		252 – Total Number of	improvements to improve	
	b. Denominator: Total number of	Complaints/Critical Incidents	reporting and afford more	
	complaints/critical incidents.	27% Complaints/Critical Incidents	opportunities to capture data:	
		that were related to	1. Provided training to BLTC	
	Sampling approach of analyzed	abuse/neglect/exploitation	staff on definitions of	
	collected data approved in current	<b>2013 – Appendix R</b>	complaints/critical incidents and	
	waiver is specified as a 100% review.	67 – Number of Complaints/Critical	developed a tool for staff to	
		Incidents related to	provide information for data	
		abuse/neglect/exploitation	collection.	
		187 – Total Number of	2. Added participant experience	
		Complaints/Critical Incidents	questions to the NRHV process	
		36% Complaints/Critical Incidents	especially in the areas of abuse,	
		that were related to	neglect, and exploitation.	
		abuse/neglect/exploitation		
		<u>2014 – Appendix S</u>	As a result of these changes the	
		177 – Number of Complaints/Critical	state has seen an increase in the	

IV. HEALTH & WELFA	ADE		
		prevent instances of abuse, neglect and exploitation	an .
Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System Improvement
		Incidents related to	overall volume of reported
		abuse/neglect/exploitation	complaints and critical incidents,
		467 – Total Number of	but has seen a decrease in
		Complaints/Critical Incidents	proportion of the substantiated
		38% Complaints/Critical Incidents	complaints/critical incidents
		that were related to	related to abuse, exploitation, and
		abuse/neglect/exploitation	neglect and have experienced no
		2015 (YTD) – Appendix T	change in the substantiated
		144 – Number of Complaints/Critical	complaints in other areas.
		Incidents related to	complaints in other areas.
		abuse/neglect/exploitation	
		288 – Total Number of	
		Complaints/Critical Incidents	
		50% Complaints/Critical Incidents	
		that were related to	
		abuse/neglect/exploitation	
		MMCP – Appendix Z	
		2014 Q3 and Q4	
		0 - complaints/critical incidents	
		related to abuse/neglect/exploitation	
		1 - complaint/critical incident	
		0% related to	
		abuse/neglect/exploitation <b>2015 (YTD)</b>	

IV. HEALTH & WELFARE On an on-going basis the state identifies, addresses and seeks to prevent instances of abuse, neglect and exploitation.					
On an on-going basis the Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System Improvement		
		5 - complaints/critical incidents related to abuse/neglect/exploitation 6 - complaint/critical incidents 83% related to abuse/neglect/exploitation	mprovement		
	Number and percent of complaints (critical incidents) of abuse, neglect and exploitation that were substantiated.	Complaint/Critical Incident Report: Based on data entered into the Statewide Complaint/Critical Incident	Refer to Appendix Q-T and Z for remediation.		
	a. Numerator: Number of complaints/critical incidents that were related to abuse, neglect and exploitation that were substantiated.	Database in SharePoint.  2012 – Appendix Q 33 – Substantiated Complaints/Critical Incidents related			

September 2015

Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System Improvement
		to abuse/neglect/exploitation	
	b. Denominator: Total number of	67 – Number of Complaints/Critical	
	complaints/critical incidents that were	Incidents related to	
	related to abuse, neglect and	abuse/neglect/exploitation	
	exploitation.	49% Complaints/critical incidents	
		related to abuse/neglect/exploitation	
	Sampling approach of analyzed	were substantiated	
	collected data approved in current	<b>2013 – Appendix R</b>	
	waiver is specified as a 100% review.	26 – Substantiated	
		Complaints/Critical Incidents related	
		to abuse/neglect/exploitation	
		67 – Number of Complaints/Critical	
		Incidents related to	
		abuse/neglect/exploitation	
		39% Complaints/critical incidents	
		related to abuse/neglect/exploitation	
		were substantiated	
		<b>2014 – Appendix S</b>	
		56 – Substantiated	
		Complaints/Critical Incidents related	
		to abuse/neglect/exploitation	
		177 – Number of Complaints/Critical	
		Incidents related to	
		abuse/neglect/exploitation	
		32% Complaints/critical incidents	

October 2012 – September 2015

related to abuse/neglect/exploitation

that were substantiated

ub Assurances	<b>Performance Measure</b>	Discovery	Remediation/System Improvement
		related to abuse/neglect/exploitation were substantiated  2015 (YTD) – Appendix T  36 – Substantiated Complaints/Critical Incidents related to abuse/neglect/exploitation  144 – Number of Complaints/Critical Incidents related to abuse/neglect/exploitation  25% Complaints/critical incidents related to abuse/neglect/exploitation were substantiated	
		MMCP – Appendix Z 2014 Q3 and Q4 0 – Complaints/critical incidents related to abuse/neglect/exploitation that were substantiated 0 – Complaints/critical incidents related to abuse/neglect/exploitation 0% Substantiated 2015 (YTD) 2 – Complaints/critical incidents	

Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System Improvement
		5 - Complaints/critical incidents	
		related to abuse/neglect/exploitation	
		40% Complaints/critical incidents	
		related to abuse/neglect/exploitation were substantiated	
	Number and percent of	Complaint/Critical Incident Report:	Refer to Appendix Q-T and Z
	complaints/critical incidents other than	Based on data entered into the	for remediation.
	abuse, neglect and exploitation that were	Statewide Complaint/Critical Incident	
	substantiated.	Database in SharePoint.	
	a. Numerator: Number of	<b>2012 – Appendix Q</b>	
	complaints/critical incidents other	87 - Number of Complaints/Critical	
	than abuse, neglect and exploitation	incidents other than	
	that were substantiated.	abuse/neglect/exploitation that were	
		substantiated	
	b. Denominator: Number of	185 - Number of Complaints/Critical	
	complaints/critical incidents other	incidents other than	
	than abuse, neglect and exploitation.	abuse/neglect/exploitation	
		47% Complaints/Critical incidents	
	Sampling approach of analyzed	other than abuse/neglect/exploitation	
	collected data approved in current	that were substantiated	
	waiver is specified as a 100% review.	2013 – Appendix R	
		51 – Number of Complaints/Critical	
		incidents other than	
		abuse/neglect/exploitation that were	

October 2012 – September 2015

#### IV. HEALTH & WELFARE On an on-going basis the state identifies, addresses and seeks to prevent instances of abuse, neglect and exploitation. **Performance Measure Remediation/System Sub Assurances Discovery Improvement** substantiated 120 – Number of Complaints/Critical incidents other than abuse/neglect/exploitation 43% Complaints/Critical incidents other than abuse/neglect/exploitation that were substantiated **2014 – Appendix S** 103 – Number of Complaints/Critical incidents other than abuse/neglect/exploitation that were substantiated 290 – Number of Complaints/Critical incidents other than abuse/neglect/exploitation 36% Complaints/Critical incidents other than abuse/neglect/exploitation that were substantiated 2015 (YTD) - Appendix T 49 – Number of Complaints/Critical incidents other than abuse/neglect/exploitation that were substantiated 144 – Number of Complaints/Critical incidents other than

September 2015

#### IV. HEALTH & WELFARE On an on-going basis the state identifies, addresses and seeks to prevent instances of abuse, neglect and exploitation. **Performance Measure Discovery Remediation/System Sub Assurances Improvement** abuse/neglect/exploitation 34% Complaints/Critical incidents other than abuse/neglect/exploitation that were substantiated MMCP – Appendix Z 2014 Q3 and Q4 0 - Complaints/critical incidents unrelated to abuse/neglect/exploitation that were substantiated 0 - Complaint/critical incident unrelated to abuse/neglect/exploitation 0% Substantiated 2015 (YTD) 0 - Complaints/critical incidents unrelated to abuse/neglect/exploitation that were substantiated 1 - Complaint/critical incident unrelated to abuse/neglect/exploitation 0% Substantiated

October 2012 – September 2015

#### V. ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY

The Medicaid Agency retains ultimate administrative authority and responsibility for the operation of the waiver program by exercising oversight of the performance of waiver functions by other state and local/regional non-state agencies (if appropriate) and contracted entities

Sub Assurance	Performance Measure		
Sub Assurance	reflormance wieasure	Discovery	Remediation/System Improvement
a. The Medicaid Agency	Number and percent of remediation	2012 Annondiy A	All issues identified through QIS
	_	2012 – Appendix A	0 -
retains ultimate	issues identified in the QIS performance	1,559 Number of Remediation Issues	reporting have follow up and
administrative authority	reports that were followed up on and	with follow up and monitoring	monitoring.
and responsibility for the	monitored through QIS reporting.	1,559 Remediation Issues identified	
operation of the waiver		in QA Reports	
program by exercising	a. Numerator: # of remediation issues	100% Remediated	
oversight of the	followed up on and monitored through	<u>2013 – Appendix B</u>	
performance of waiver	QIS reporting.	1,681 - Number of Remediation	
functions by other state		Issues with follow up and monitoring	
and local/regional non-	b. Denominator: # of remediation issues	1,681 - Number of Remediation	
state agencies (if	identified in the QIS performance	Issues identified in QA Reports	
appropriate) and	reports.	100% Remediated	
contracted entities.		<b>2014 – Appendix C</b>	
	Sampling approach of analyzed	1,804 - Number of Remediation	
	collected data approved in current	Issues with follow up and monitoring	
	waiver is specified as a 100% review.	1,804 – Number of Remediation	
	1	Issues identified in QA Reports	
		100% Remediated	
		2015 (YTD) – Appendix D	
		1,150 - Number of Remediation	
		Issues with follow up and monitoring	
		1,150 – Number of Remediation	
		Issues identified in QA Reports	
		100% Remediated	
		100% Kemediated	

IV. HEALTH & WELFARE				
On an on-going basis the state identifies, addresses and seeks to prevent instances of abuse, neglect and exploitation.				
Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System	
			Improvement	
		MMCP – The Idaho Department of Health and Welfare maintains authority and oversight over the health plan's administration of A&D waiver services and functions. The MMCP Scope of Work detailing the health plan's responsibilities in administering A&D waiver services can be located at:  http://healthandwelfare.idaho.gov/Portals/0/Medical/Managed%20Care/MMCPScopeOfWork2015-2016.pdf		
	Number and percent of system improvements identified in QIS performance reports that were implemented and monitored through QIS reporting.	2012 – Appendix A 3 – System Improvements Implemented 4 – System Improvements Identified through Quality Reporting	Refer to Appendix A-D for System Improvements  2012 – (1) System Improvement identified to improve provider	
	a. Numerator: Number of system improvements identified as needed through the QIS performance reports implemented and monitored through QIS reporting.	75% Implemented  2013 – Appendix B  3 – System Improvements Implemented  4 – System Improvements Identified through Quality Reporting  75% - Implemented	documentation service plans updated when the participant had a change in condition. This improvement was completed in 2014 by the development of online training modules in both Service Plans and	

**September 2015** 

IV. HEALTH & WELFARE					
On an on-going basis the state identifies, addresses and seeks to prevent instances of abuse, neglect and exploitation.					
Sub Assurances	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System		
			Improvement		
	b. Denominator: Number of system	<b>2014 – Appendix C</b>	Documentation.		
	improvements identified as needed	2 – System Improvements	<b>2013</b> – (1) System Improvement		
	through the QIS performance	Implemented	identified in Q4 of 2013 to		
	reports.	2 – System Improvements Identified	improve documentation of		
		through Quality Reporting	complaints – process and training		
	Sampling approach of analyzed	100% Implemented	was developed in 2014 which has		
	collected data approved in current	<b>2015 (YTD) – Appendix D</b>	resulted in a 100% improvement		
	waiver is specified as a 100% review.	3 – System Improvements	in compliant documentation in		
		Implemented	2014.		
		3 – System Improvements Identified			
		through Quality Reporting			
		100% Implemented			

VI. FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY				
The State must demonstrate that it has designed and implemented an adequate system for insuring financial accountability of the waiver program				
Sub Assurance	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System	
			Improvement	
State financial oversight	Number and percent of waiver service	Data is based on complaints of fraud	Refer to Appendix Q-T and AA	
exists to assure that claims	providers who had fraudulent billing	that are substantiated through the	for remediation.	
are coded and paid for in	patterns investigated by IDHW and	State of Idaho's Medicaid Program		
accordance with the	action taken.	Integrity Unit.	The State's monitoring process	
reimbursement methodology			for verifying the maintenance of	
specified in the approved	a. Numerator: Number of waiver service	<u>2012 – Appendix Q</u>	appropriate financial records by	
waiver.	providers who had fraudulent billing	50 – Number of providers with	providers is through on-going site	
	patterns that were investigated and	substantiated fraudulent billing	visits conducted with providers to	

VI. FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY				
	at it has designed and implemented an adeq			
Sub Assurance	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System	
			Improvement	
	action taken by the Department.	patterns	verify that they maintain financial	
		63 – Total Number of providers	records according to provider	
	b. Denominator: Number of waiver	reported for fraudulent billing	agreements/contracts through	
	service providers who were reported for	patterns	ongoing provider quality reviews	
	fraudulent billing patterns.	79% of providers with substantiated	(Appendices M-P).	
		fraudulent billing patterns		
	Sampling approach of analyzed	<u>2013 – Appendix R</u>	During the NRHV process,	
	collected data approved in current	26 – Number of providers with	complaints/critical incidents and	
	waiver is specified as a 100% review.	substantiated fraudulent billing	provider quality assurance	
		patterns	processes, instances of potential	
		43 – Total Number of providers	improper billing practices/fraud	
		reported for fraudulent billing	are identified. If there is	
		patterns	information to substantiate it;	
		60% of providers with substantiated	referrals are made through the	
		fraudulent billing patterns	program manager to the MPIU.	
		<b>2014 – Appendix S</b>		
		41 – Number of providers with	The state does not have a	
		substantiated fraudulent billing	performance measure reflected in	
		patterns	the approved waiver period to	
		60 – Total Number of providers	collect results of a review of	
		reported for fraudulent billing	provider claims to verify that they	
		patterns	are coded and paid in accordance	
		68% of providers with substantiated	with the approved reimbursement	
		fraudulent billing patterns	methodology.	
		<b>2015 (YTD) – Appendix T</b>		

Sub Assurance	Performance Measure	Discovery	Remediation/System Improvement
		13 – Number of providers with	
		substantiated fraudulent billing	
		patterns	
		21 – Total Number of providers	
		reported for fraudulent billing	
		patterns	
		62% of providers with substantiated	
		fraudulent billing patterns	
		MMCP – Appendix AA	
		2014 Q3 and Q4	
		0 - MCE waiver providers referred to	
		the Department for investigation and	
		action	
		1 - MCE waiver provider reported to	
		the MCE for fraudulent billing	
		patterns	
		0% of MCE waiver providers who	
		had fraudulent billing patterns and	
		were referred to the Department for	
		investigation and action. <b>2015 YTD</b>	
		0 - MCE waiver providers referred to	
		the Department for investigation and	

VI. FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY					
The State must demonstrate that it has designed and implemented an adequate system for insuring financial accountability of the waiver program					
Sub Assurance	Sub Assurance Performance Measure Discovery Remediation/System				
			Improvement		
		6 - MCE waiver providers reported to			
		the MCE for fraudulent billing			
		patterns			
		0% of MCE waiver providers who			
		had fraudulent billing patterns and			
		were referred to the Department for			
		investigation and action			